

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12-19, 21, 26-29 and 31-33 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 15, 19, 21 and 29 being independent. Claims 1, 7, 12-15, 19, 21 and 26-29 have been amended. No claims have been canceled.

### **Claim Rejections under §103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-7, 12-19, 21, 26-29 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,807,636 (Hartman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,765,153 (Benantar). For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's attorney herein amends claims 1, 7, 12-15, 19, 21 and 26-29.

**Independent claim 1**, as amended, recites a kernel-level transaction system, comprising (emphasis added):

- a memory;
- one or more processors operatively coupled to the memory and disposed within one or more devices;
- a **kernel-level transaction manager** disposed within each device, each said kernel-level transaction manager including a plurality of kernel objects to implement a transaction having plural operations, wherein the plurality of kernel objects include a transaction object to represent a transaction, a resource manager object to represent a resource participating in the transaction, and an enlistment object to enlist participants in the

transaction, wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel-level; and

- a security descriptor, applied to at least one of the kernel objects, to identify at least one user, to identify one of the operations of the transaction that may be performed on the kernel object to which the security descriptor is applied, and to identify a right indicating that the identified user is permitted or prohibited to perform the operation.

The Office argues that Hartman in view of Benantar renders the subject matter of claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant herein amends independent claim 1, as discussed during the interview, to recite that the “kernel-level transaction system” comprises “a kernel-level transaction manager”.

Hartman, meanwhile, is directed towards “systems, means and methods that facilitate security in a network.” (Column 7, lines 40-42) Hartman does not teach or suggest “a kernel-level transaction system” that includes “a kernel-level transaction manager...to implement a transaction...wherein the transaction is performed at the kernel-level,” as cited in amended claim 1. During the aforementioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to tentatively agree. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

Furthermore, while the Office also cites Benantar in rejecting this claim before its amendment, Benantar also fails to teach or suggest Applicant’s amended claim language.

**Dependent claims 3-6** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

**Independent claim 7** is directed toward a “method of implementing a kernel-level transaction, comprising... one of a plurality of kernel objects utilized in a kernel-level transaction” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

**Claims 12-14** depend from independent claim 7 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 7, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

**Independent claim 15** is directed toward a “computer-readable medium having stored thereon an object attached to a kernel object...wherein the kernel object comprises a transaction object to represent a transaction...performed at the kernel-level” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 7 above.

**Claims 16-18** depend from independent claim 15 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 15, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

**Independent claim 19** is directed toward “a kernel-level transaction method, comprising...implementing a kernel-level transaction among kernel objects” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7 and 15.

**Independent claim 21** is directed toward “a method of implementing a kernel-level transaction, comprising: attaching a security descriptor to at least one of a plurality of objects utilized in a kernel-level transaction” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, 15 and 19 above.

**Claims 26-28** depend from independent claim 21 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 21, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

**Independent claim 29** is directed toward “a kernel-level transaction system, comprising...means for implementing a kernel-level transaction among kernel objects” and is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1, 7, 15, 19 and 21 above.

**Claims 31-33** depend from independent claim 29 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 29, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

## **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: November 25, 2008

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff/

Dale G. Mohlenhoff  
Reg. No. 37,683  
(509) 944-4738

Robert G. Hartman  
Reg. No. 58,970  
(509) 944-4765